

Applicant : Thomas W. Smith  
Serial No. : 10/658,896  
Filed : September 10, 2003  
Page : 7 of 13

Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544

### REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 3, 7-9, 11-13 and 18-20 are amended to correct informalities. No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

The originally filed claims 1-20 stand rejected. None of the claims at this stage of prosecution is allowed or deemed allowable. None of the claims are withdrawn from consideration, and thus all have been examined. Reconsideration based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### **I. Objection to the Specification**

The specification is objected to for informalities (corresponding to paragraph [0008] in the publication. Applicant amends the specification accordingly. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

#### **II. Objection to the Claims**

Claims 3, 7-9, 11, 12, 18-20 are objected to regarding informalities. Applicant amends the claims in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. Instead of changing the conjunction "and" to --or-- for claims 3, 7 and 12, as indicated in the Office Action, Applicant replaces "one or more of" with --at least one of-- in order to avoid ambiguity. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the claims objection.

#### **III. Indefiniteness Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

The Office Action rejects claims 8 and 13 as being allegedly indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant amends claim 8 in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. Although claim 13 is amended for clarity, Applicant observes that the term "room" is recited twice, the first with an indefinite article and the second with the definite article. Applicant respectfully requests the indefiniteness rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Applicant : Thomas W. Smith  
Serial No. : 10/658,896  
Filed : September 10, 2003  
Page : 8 of 13

Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544

#### **IV. Anticipatory Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 17 and 19 as being allegedly anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 7,152,207 to Underwood *et al.* (hereinafter "Underwood"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

##### **A. Features of Independent Claims**

Applicant's features are directed to system claims 1 and 14 and to method claim 17 that include a baseline web site (202) having web pages (206), a mirror web site (204), and a web application (214) running on the mirror web site, both sites being accessible through a network (110) to authorized users via client communication devices (112, 122). Initially, the mirror web site is a mirror copy of the (primarily read-only) baseline web site and subsequently accepts user-made changes to the copy.

The specification describes the system such that an administrator authorizes the changes to update the baseline web site to conform to the mirror web site. For example, the specification discloses various exemplary aspects of a system with wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays (104) are attached to walls (102) of a room (100), such as for a war-room display of information. At least one server (108) is connected to the network and hosts the baseline and mirror web sites.

Applicant's method in claim 17 provides operations for accessing a baseline web site (202) by an authorized user through a network (110); cutting and pasting by the user to a mirror web site (204) via a web application (214); and approving and copying the changes to the baseline web site by an administrator. The baseline web site has a plurality of web pages (206). The mirror web site is initially a mirror copy of the baseline web site and executes the web application.

Underwood does not teach or suggest a system including a baseline web site that is primarily and ordinarily read-only, having a plurality of web pages being remotely accessible by authorized users through a network via client communication devices communicatively coupled to the network; a mirror web site that is initially a mirror copy of the baseline web site and that is remotely accessible by the authorized users through the network via the client communication devices communicatively coupled to the network; and a web application running on the mirror web site to accept user-made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in a cut-and-

Applicant : Thomas W. Smith  
Serial No. : 10/658,896  
Filed : September 10, 2003  
Page : 9 of 13

Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544

paste manner, one or more administrators being able to authorize the user-made changes such that the baseline web site is periodically updated from the mirror web site, as recited in claim 1.

Also, Underwood fails to teach or suggest a method including accessing by an authorized user a baseline web site having a plurality of web pages through a network; cutting and pasting changes by the authorized user to a mirror web site that is initially a mirror copy of the baseline web site via a web application running on the mirror web site; and approving the changes by an authorized administrative user to cause the changes to be copied back to the baseline web site, as recited in claim 17.

#### **B. Teachings of Primary Reference**

Instead, Underwood discloses a technique for generating a website by providing a universal interface. In particular, Underwood teaches a server 105 that connects to client terminals 125 via the Internet 120 to provide an interface to Designer software. Website content can be managed through template modules of the Designer software to establish dimensions, visual characteristics and format for display at a browser address. See *e.g.*, col. 11, lines 12-24, 55-63; col. 13, lines 49-57 and Figs. 1-2 of Underwood.

Further, Underwood discloses a Site Designer page 600. In particular, Underwood teaches text boxes for a From site name 625 and a New site name 630, with a Copy button 640 enabling a copy of the site template to be saved in the server 105 under the New site name. See *e.g.*, col. 14, lines 30-42 and Fig. 6 of Underwood. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of a web application running on the mirror web site to accept user-made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in a cut-and-paste manner, one or more administrators being able to authorize the user-made changes such that the baseline web site is periodically updated from the mirror web site, as recited in Applicant's independent claims. Rather, Underwood merely transfers template content to a server under a specified file name.

Also, Underwood teaches an edit store 6615 communicates with a data store 6620 as an information repository with caching at web server 6630. See *e.g.*, col. 39, lines 3-30 and Fig. 66 of Underwood. Nonetheless, Underwood fails to teach or suggest that the mirror web site is initially a mirror copy of the baseline web site with changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in a cut-and-paste manner, as provided in the claims.

Applicant : Thomas W. Smith  
Serial No. : 10/658,896  
Filed : September 10, 2003  
Page : 10 of 13

Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544

### C. Statutory Requirements for Anticipation

A claim must be literally disclosed for a proper rejection under §102(a), (b) or (e). This requirement is satisfied "only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." See MPEP §2131. Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to satisfy this requirement with Underwood, including but not limited to features related to updating the baseline web site from changes made to the mirror web site using a web application executed by the latter.

### V. First Obviousness Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action further rejects claim 4 as being allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Underwood in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0064352 to Gordon *et al.* (hereinafter "Gordon"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness for a §103 rejection requires satisfaction of three basic criteria: there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references or knowledge generally available to modify the references or combine reference teachings, a reasonable expectation of success, and the references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP §706.02(j). Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to satisfy these requirements with Underwood and Gordon.

Gordon does not compensate for the deficiencies of Underwood outlined above for claim 1. Nor does Gordon teach, disclose or suggest the additional features recited in claim 4 for data represented by scanned-in information from non-electronic, hardcopy media. Instead, Gordon discloses a LeagueBoss™ database of sports information that enables entry of multiple sets of statistics for data correlation at multiple sites. In particular, Gordon teaches a services provider 11 connected to a memory 12 and to a server 13, which maintains a main website and controls communication. An administrator 20 is connected to a printer and separately by a communication link 19 to the server 13. See, for example, paragraphs [0016] – [0017] and Fig. 1 of Gordon.

Further, there is no motivation to combine features related to the sports database of Gordon with the website builder of Underwood. Although the applied references are associated with networked websites, their approaches and solutions differ from each other, and have no

Applicant : Thomas W. Smith  
Serial No. : 10/658,896  
Filed : September 10, 2003  
Page : 11 of 13

Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544

relationship to providing a web change management system for control of changes using a mirrored version of the database, leading to an expected lack of success from combining these teachings. Moreover, the Office Action has not established sufficient motivation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming that motivation to combine the applied references is established, the combination fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed features.

**VI. Second Obviousness Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action further rejects claims 8, 13, 14, 16, 18 and 20 as being allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Underwood in view of U.S. Patent 6,313,855 to Shuping *et al.* (hereinafter "Shuping"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Underwood and Shuping, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays for mounting on walls of a room; at least one server to host a baseline web site and a mirror web site, each server communicatively coupled to a network, the baseline web site being primarily and ordinarily read-only, and having a plurality of web pages for primary display on the plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays, the plurality of web pages being remotely accessible outside of the room by authorized users through the network via client communication devices communicatively coupled to the network, the mirror web site being initially a mirror copy of the baseline web site and locally accessible within the room and remotely accessible outside of the room by the authorized users through the network via the client communication devices communicatively coupled to the network; and a web application running on the mirror web site to accept user-made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in a cut-and-paste manner, one or more administrators being able to authorize the user-made changes such that the baseline web site is periodically updated from the mirror web site, the web application receptive to additional and replacement data serving as the user-made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in the cut-and-paste manner from other applications running on the client communication devices, as recited in claim 14.

Moreover, Shuping does not compensate for the deficiencies of Underwood outlined above for claims 1 and 17. Nor does Shuping teach, disclose or suggest the additional features

Applicant : Thomas W. Smith  
Serial No. : 10/658,896  
Filed : September 10, 2003  
Page : 12 of 13

Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544

recited in claims 8, 13, 18 and 20 regarding mountable, multiple user-viewable displays and additional and replacement data from an application running on a client communication device.

Instead, Shuping discloses a method of browsing websites such as Google<sup>®</sup>, enabling examination of past, present, and future links. In particular, Shuping teaches a browsing room 300 showing a current wall 310, a past wall 320 and a future wall 330, such as side-by-side and angularly off-set. Each wall corresponds to a panel of previously visited, present or intended websites. See, for example, col. 6, lines 45-62 and Fig. 3 of Shuping.

Further, there is no motivation to combine features related to the link browsing method of Shuping with the website builder of Underwood. There is no practical benefit to displaying multiple chronologically visited websites in Shuping in conjunction with template selection of page creation in Underwood. Although the applied references are associated with networked websites, their approaches and solutions differ from each other, and have no relationship to providing a web change management system for control of changes using a mirrored version of the database. Moreover, the Office Action has not established sufficient motivation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming that motivation to combine the applied references is established, the combination fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed features.

#### VII. Third Obviousness Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action further rejects claim 15 as being allegedly anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Underwood in view of Shuping and Gordon. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Shuping and Gordon do not compensate for the deficiencies of Underwood outlined above for claim 14. Nor do Shuping and Gordon teach, disclose or suggest the additional features recited in claim 15 for scanning devices to update data. Instead, Gordon discloses an input device 23 (e.g., a scanner) connected to the administrator 20 that receives data for display. See, for example, paragraph [0018] and Fig. 1 of Gordon. Meanwhile, neither Shuping nor Underwood provides any teaching of scanners for whatever context and offers no rationale for incorporating them.

Further, there is no motivation to combine features related to the link-browsing method of Shuping and the sports database of Gordon with the website builder of Underwood for reasons

Applicant : Thomas W. Smith  
Serial No. : 10/658,896  
Filed : September 10, 2003  
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544

discussed *supra*. Moreover, the Office Action has not established sufficient motivation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming that motivation to combine the applied references is established, the combination fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed features.

#### VIII. Applicant's Request

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claims 1, 14 and 17 are patentable over the applied references. The dependent claims are likewise patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed, as well as for the additional features they recite. Consequently, all the claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 be withdrawn.

#### IX. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerhard W. Thielman  
Registration No. 43,186

Date: June 29, 2007

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
Naval Surface Warfare Center – Dahlgren Division  
Office of Counsel – Code XDC1  
17632 Dahlgren Road, Suite 158  
Dahlgren, Virginia 22448-5110  
Telephone: (540) 653-8061 Customer No. 23501

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 50-0967